

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

From: Downing, Jane
Sent: Fri 2/26/2016 4:56:38 PM
Subject: FW: PFOA data differs?
[pfoa NE 10-15.xlsx](#)

Hi All

Just FYI

For your records here is the latest table on UCMR PFOA hits. With eagle eyes in RI, it switches Cumberland RI which is now the highest value.

Take Care

Jane

From: Ryan, Chris
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 10:27 AM
To: Downing, Jane <Downing.Jane@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PFOA data differs?

Jane –

Amy Parmenter down in RI just pointed out to me that several of the values in the PFOA table I gave you were incorrect, and she was right. I don't know how I managed to transpose the values in the spreadsheet, but I did.

Attached is the corrected spreadsheet.

Chris

Chris Ryan

Environmental Scientist

Drinking Water Quality and Protection Unit

Drinking Water Branch - OEP 6-3

USEPA New England – Region 1

5 Post Office Square - Suite 100

Boston, MA 02109-3912

email: ryan.chris@epa.gov

phone: 617 918-1567

fax: 617 918-0567

From: Parmenter, Amy (DOH)

Sent: Friday, February 26, 20

To: Ryan, Chris <ryan.chris@epa.gov>

Subject: PFOA data differs?

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Hi Chris,

The spreadsheet Jane attached here is different from the UCMR3 occurrence data provided on the website. The spreadsheet in the email shows the Town of Cumberland had 0.02 ug/L and the UCMR3 occurrence data has 0.081 ug/L. I compared another one on the attached list, Hudson Water Supply, and that value is different too.

I was hoping you can tell me which one is correct. I'm simultaneously working with the water system to figure this out, but they're having a hard time getting the results from the lab and we're not sure how much longer it's going to take. I'll let you know when I do hear.

Thanks,

Amy B. Parmenter

Hydrogeologist/Water Quality Specialist

RI Dept. of Health, Center for Drinking Water Quality

3 Capitol Hill, Rm 209

Providence, RI 02908

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

<http://www.health.ri.gov/programs/drinkingwaterquality/>

From: Downing, Jane [<mailto:Downing.Jane@epa.gov>]

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 9:56 AM

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy us;

Subject: PFOA

PFOA statement in Region 2.

Morning All

Remember the expression “When it Rains it Pours”. Well here’s one more thing to assess.

R2 just came out with a Do Not Drink/Do Not Cook advisory for private well owners with PFOA in drinking water at above 100 parts per trillion (0.1 ppb). We understand that the final provisional health advisory documents for PFOA are still expected to come out of HQs by March. At such time there may also be a readjustment in the PFOS health advisory.

Nevertheless, with a number out there on PFOA, I had Chris run the UCMR data for PFOA. See attached. We do not have any system with PFOA above 100 parts per trillion. However, Hudson is at 81 ppt; Hyannis 67/62/50 ppt; Danvers at 42/25 ppt; etc.

To see what is around these systems, Marcel is looking into mapping Hudson and Danvers and Westfield.. We believe that Hyannis is treating??

Yvette – unfortunately the bulk of the hits fall in MA. Can you confirm that Hyannis is OK (e.g. treatment in place) and let me know anything else you know about the rest. We will share the mapping exercises once completed. I’ve also asked Marcel to check on the recent Silent Spring Report to pull out PFOA data.

Sarah/June – let me know if any pertinent info on your systems and if you want us to map.

That’s’ it for now (I hope)

You know where I am in case other questions.

Have a great weekend

Jane

